

# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches* Number of "Pax,"  
founded 1931.)

---

VOL. V

APRIL-JUNE, 1944

NO. 10

---

## ST. ATHANASIUS CONCERNING THE WISDOM OF GOD

Sedi Sapientae  
Ecclesiae sanctae Deiferae  
Domnae Mariae Dei parae  
Fidelibus Christiferis cunctis

"The Lord created me" in St. Athanasius.

THE LORD possessed me (who am Wisdom) in the beginning of his ways. This verse from Proverbs and those that follow have for us who hear them again and again in the Sacred Liturgy a singular interest and depth. They are there most often accommodated to Eternal Wisdom's Mother, herself the Seat of Wisdom. They may likewise be applied to each of the faithful in the degree to which he is mature and perfect in the life of the Spirit. As St. Paul says: Wisdom we speak among those who are mature. . . and farther on: we have the Spirit that is from God, that we may know the things that have been given us by God (I Cor., ii, 6 and 12).

But neither of these interpretations reaches the depth of meaning in the passage. They do not begin with the beginning, as Gregory of Nanzianzen tells us we should in celebrating any feast—that is we must begin with God. We must begin then with the Eternal Wisdom; then the Incarnate Wisdom, then the fulness of the Incarnate Wisdom—the Holy Church of God; after these we may come to the particular applications, to our Lady Mary, to the other saints and doctors, to ourselves, in some small way.

Yet no one of these interpretations is exclusive of the other;

but it must be said that the particular interpretations permit us to neglect the fuller meanings. That then we may gather the utmost from this passage, we could do no better than to understand it of the Church which is indeed Christ's body, the fulness of him who is wholly fulfilled in all (Eph. i, 23).

Of the fathers, St. Athanasius treats of this passage most copiously, explicitly interprets it in regard to the Church in two places (*On the Incarnation and Against the Arians*, §§6 and 12), and in his Discourses against the Arians so expounds it of the Incarnate Wisdom and of Wisdom's created image in the creature (ii, 78) that we may justly infer that for him there was but a single reality of which Scripture here speaks.

What follows, then, represents St. Athanasius' own mind, so far as I have been able to grasp it, omitting however what pertains only to the refutation of the Arian error.

St. Athanasius based himself entirely on the Greek text: The Lord hath created me a beginning of ways for his works. He therefore nowhere understands the passage of that wisdom which is a common attribute of the Godhead. Nor does he understand it of the eternally begotten Wisdom—the Son—without reference to the Incarnation.<sup>1</sup>

St. Athanasius' first care in his discourses against the Arians was to refute their primary assertion; the Son is a creature. In accord with this they understood the "created me" in the strict sense of bringing into existence. St. Athanasius denies that this is in any way necessary, since it may be understood as complementary to the "Before all hills he begat me" (vs. 25, LXX), which speaks of the eternal generation of Wisdom; and as parallel with "Wisdom hath built herself a house" (9, 1), the house, of course, he understands of our human nature, the body assumed by the Word.

The meaning of "created" as used here he elucidates with psalm i, verse 12: "Create a clean heart within me, O God," and psalm ii, 6: "I am appointed king by him over Sion his holy mountain." The sense then is: The Lord hath appointed (or established) me a beginning for his works. The reference is to the *office* assumed by the Word and Son of God, not to his substance and nature.

"The beginning of ways" Athanasius elucidates with the aid of two Pauline phrases, in which Christ is called the first-born of all creation (Col. i, 15) and first-born among

<sup>1</sup> Following the Hebrew and Vulgate texts, both these interpretations are possible.



many brethren (Rom. viii, 29). By the first phrase Christ is excluded from the number of created things ; for he is first over all creation, since in the Greek there is a sense of opposition between the adjective "first-born" and the modifying phrase "of all creation".<sup>1</sup> Thus the divine nature is secured. In the second phrase, first-born among many brethren, the reference is to Christ's human nature. For Christ is the first-born not "of" but "among" many brethren.

"For his works" receives only incidental attention. The phrase but confirms St. Athanasius' main contention, that the "created me" is for the sake of the works. The works then must have existed before the "created me" was said. And once again it is evident that the "created me" can only refer to the Incarnate Dispensation.

Such, in very brief outline, is St. Athanasius' fundamental exegesis of the famous passage. He continues, however, with an exposition of the following verses, especially the next : "He has founded me before the world" (8, 23, LXX). With this verse as another occasion he develops the same arguments and conclusion : the Son is not a creature. But in considering this text he is led, by the very significance of the terms used, to another group of New Testament texts that bear more immediately on the Church. The Lord has made Wisdom a foundation, but there can be no other foundation than that which is laid, Christ Jesus (I Cor. iii, 11) ; and a foundation's only function is to be built upon. Thus the fulness of the body of Christ is forcefully brought before us as an integral part, we may say, of that Incarnate Dispensation, which was the object of Athanasius' fundamental interpretation of the foregoing verse (8, 22).

The sacred writer does not only say "he has founded me" but adds "before the world." How can this be ? In the Word, says St. Athanasius, the grace of salvation was prepared before all worlds, but appeared only when the Saviour dwelt among us. As St. Paul says : Enter into my sufferings for the gospel through the power of God. He has redeemed and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and the grace which was granted to us in Christ Jesus before this world existed, but is now manifested by the enlightenment of our Saviour Jesus Christ (II Tim. i, 8—10). And : Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who has blessed us with

<sup>1</sup> See Newman, *St. Athanasius*, vol. I p. 329, note.

every spiritual blessing on high in Christ. Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blemish in his sight in love; predestinating us to be adopted through Jesus Christ as his sons (Eph. i, 3—5). These and the like passages that he cites in this connection concern our predestination in Christ. Scripture more frequently speaks in this way than of the predestination of Christ's proper human nature. So once more the Church is brought before our eyes, though not yet by name.

When finally Athanasius does come explicitly to refer the "created me" to the Church, it is in direct sequel to a passage<sup>1</sup> dealing with our fellowship in Christ's suffering and glorification, in which he refers to our part therein by the plural pronouns "we" or "they"<sup>2</sup> as the case may require. Then in the next paragraph (§6) he writes: Similarly too when he says "the Lord hath created me a beginning of his ways" he says it of the Church, which is created in him. In the same paragraph Athanasius quotes: In order that through the Church there be made known to the Principalities and the Powers in the heavens the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which he accomplished in Christ Jesus our Lord. In whom we have assurance and confident access through faith in him (Eph. iii, 10—12). And once again the passage from the first chapter of Ephesians: Even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world. . . (i, 4).

To put then our thought in a word: St. Athanasius in expounding this passage of Proverbs interprets it fundamentally of the two elements as contained in the personal union of the divine and human natures in Christ; this in direct refutation of the Arian blasphemies. When, however, he looks beyond this union to our participation in it he has primarily in mind the Church. For the order of salvation is: first, the human race, the Church, then individuals. This is more especially true when the Church is looked upon as predestined, according to this phrase of St. Athanasius: "Before all hills he begat me," he speaks in the person of the Church, who being created before is afterwards begotten of God (*On the Incarnation and Against the Arians*, §12).

<sup>1</sup> *On the Incarnation and Against the Arians*, §5.

<sup>2</sup> The pronouns "we" and "they" when used with universal application are the equivalent of a reference to the Church. Cf. Rom. viii: 32 and Eph. v: 25.



We have now to return to three passages in the second discourse against the Arians which deal, ultimately, with the reason for our predestination in him, and which at the same time reveal to us the reason for the community of reference, in this and similar passages of Scripture, to the Son, to the Church, to our Lady Mary and to all of the saints in their degree of perfection.

"How, asks St. Athanasius, has he chosen us before we came into existence, but that, as he says himself, In him we were represented beforehand?" (Newman's *St. Athanasius*, Vol. I, §211). Here is the secret: our configuration in him. There are three stages: first we are ordained in him before all ages; then we are made and also reborn in him in this world; finally we reach the consummation in the Kingdom of the Father in him. Further on Athanasius says: "For as of the Son of God, considered as the Word, our word is an image, so of the same Son considered as Wisdom is the wisdom which is implanted in us an image; in which wisdom we, having the power of knowledge and thought, become recipients of the All-framing Wisdom; and through It we are able to know Its Father" (ib. §215).

This image is twofold; that created in all Wisdom's works, which on being known leads to the All-framing Wisdom; and that which is ours by the indwelling of the Incarnate Wisdom. "For no longer, as in former times, has God willed to be known by a mere image and shadow of Wisdom, that namely which is in the creature, but he has made the true Wisdom Itself to take flesh, and to become man, and to undergo the death of the cross; that by their faith in him, henceforth all that believe may obtain salvation. However, it is the same Wisdom of God, which in the first instance by means of Its own image in the creatures (whence also it is said to be created), manifested first Itself, and through Itself Its own Father; and afterwards, being Itself the Word, 'became flesh,' as John says, and after abolishing death and saving our race, still further revealed Himself and through Himself His own Father, saying, 'Grant unto them that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.'"

"Hence the whole earth is filled with the knowledge of him; for the knowledge of the Father through the Son and of the Son from the Father is one and the same, and the Father delights in him, and in that joy the Son rejoices in the Father,

saying, 'I was by him, daily his delight, rejoicing always before him'" (Ib. §§221, 222, ii, 81).

Finally this type and image in us of him and in all creatures is found not alone in each thing and person singly, but also in the whole. Thus, too, "we were represented beforehand in him"; and this fore-representation is of such reality that, as we have already noted, Athanasius can speak of the "Church created beforehand, and afterwards begotten of God." But the Church is image-bearing even in its earthly existence; Athanasius says: "Moreover that the Son should be speaking of the impress that is within us as if it were himself, should not startle anyone, considering that, when Saul was persecuting the Church, *in which was his impress and image*, he said as if he were himself under persecution, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" (§218).

There is no reason then for being startled. Wisdom speaks of things bearing Its image as of Itself. The image is the foundation for that community of reference, found so frequently in Scripture, to Christ, who is here the imaged, to the Church, which comprehends both Christ and the Virgin, to the Lady Mary herself, to the saints and to all of us.

To God therefore be glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus.

DOM POLYCARP SHERWOOD.

## THE *HODEGETRIA* EIKON

*Editor's Note.*—This article has been compiled from notes furnished, with historical data, by Prince Max of Saxony.

The two illustrations (opposite) of this type of eikon of Our Lady are those of (i) Our Lady of Smolensk, much venerated in Russia. This eikon was borne before the Russian army at the battle of Borodino in 1812. And (ii) Our Lady Czestochowa, the most ancient of the images of Our Lady in Poland. It was first placed in the chapel of the castle of Belza in Red Ruthenia. Then, on account of the raids of the Tartars, the eikon was moved to Jasna Gora, near Gzestochowa where a church and monastery were built and the monks of the Order of St. Paul, the first hermit, came from Hungary to be its guardians in the thirteenth century.

We may certainly trust that as both Catholics and Orthodox honour the Great Mother of God under this title at their various shrines, she will deign to hear their prayers and to be the means whereby Christ's prayer that they "may all be one" will be fulfilled.

DEVOTION to eikons, always an essential part of Orthodox life, was, especially in the later centuries, characteristic of spirituality in Constantinople and throughout the Byzantine Empire. Those held in greatest veneration were the pictures which represented the Mother of God holding the Child Jesus in her arms. The reasons for this preference were twofold: firstly, because Our Lady was patroness of Constantinople; and secondly, because these eikons served to refute both the monophysitic teaching and the Nestorian heresy. The most famous among these eikons was that known as the *Hodegetria*, the Virgin of Guidance.

History and legend have always had much to tell of the *Hodegetria*. Veneration to this eikon may be traced back to the time of Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II (408—450). Pulcheria was a strong opponent of the Nestorian heresy and founded the most famous of the churches in Constantinople dedicated to Our Lady. There is a legend that her sister-in-law, the Empress Eudocia, sent her from Jerusalem, a picture of the Mother of God holding the Child Jesus in her arms, which was attributed, among others, to St. Luke. It is



difficult to say, with any degree of certainty, how the eikon acquired its name of the *Hodegetria*. According to Nicetas Choniates the name was derived from the shrine at Byzantium which housed the eikon, and there is a legend that Pulcheria had a little church built to contain it. Whether they were erected by Pulcheria or not, there certainly were, at a later date, a shrine and a monastery of the *Hodegetria* where the eikon was kept until Constantinople fell to the Turks. According to another legend, two blind men recovered their sight through Mary's intercession and she was therefore called the *Hodegetria*, the Guide. Again, the name may have come into use through the custom of carrying the eikon with the army on campaigns.

Three times the *Hodegetria* appears to have been instrumental in delivering Constantinople from siege. The first and most famous occasion took place in 626 while Heraclius was in Asia fighting the Persians. The city was attacked simultaneously from land and sea, by the Persians from Asia Minor and by the Avars from the Balkans. The Patriarch Sergius, who was defending the city, recommended the inhabitants to invoke the aid of its patroness, Mary. He is said to have ordered the eikons of the Mother of God (among them, no doubt, the *Hodegetria*) to be carried in procession round the walls, followed by an eikon of Our Lord, and, according to a doubtful legend, a vestment of Mary. Be that as it may, the deliverance of the city was attributed to Mary's prayers. Thirty-six years later, under the reign of Constantine Pogonatus (The Bearded), the city was again delivered from a seven years' siege by the Mohammedan Arabs, and once again the victory was ascribed to Our Lady's intercession. On the third occasion, the city was saved from siege by the Arabs at the beginning of the reign of Leo III, the Isaurian, who was later responsible for the iconoclastic dispute. The *Hodegetria* was again carried round the walls in procession at the time when danger was most imminent, and the subsequent victory was again attributed to the Mother of God. In order to commemorate these three acts of deliverance, the fifth Saturday in Lent is kept in the Orthodox Church as the great feast of the *Akathistos*,<sup>1</sup> when this most famous of all Byzantine hymns to Our Lady is sung standing.

It is probable that the fame of the *Hodegetria* is due to the

<sup>1</sup> The *Akathistos* was said to have been composed on the occasion of the first deliverance under Heraclius.



happenings described above. The eikon was regarded as a palladium and the emperors would take it with them in time of war. Perhaps this custom originated with the singing of a special office invoking the help of the Mother of God when war threatened. There is such an office in existence, and at that time it was probably sung round the eikon in Byzantium; this may have led to the custom of taking the eikon on campaigns as a pledge of victory and to encourage and inspire the men.

Michael Psellos<sup>1</sup> tells us the following story of events which are said to have occurred during the reign of Romanus III (1028—1034). Romanus was once defeated by the Mohammedan Syrians; his army was routed and his tent was captured. As he was about to flee, he observed the eikon which alone had not fallen into the hands of the foe. At the sight of the eikon he was greatly moved, remembering how, in times past, the Mother of God had saved the Empire, for he was her fervent devotee. So great indeed were the courage and strength with which he was then inspired, that his spirit returned and he was able to rally his demoralized army.

Another story relates how, when the emperor John Comnenos (1118—1143) had conquered the Mohammedans, he entered Byzantium in solemn procession and acclaimed the *Hodegetria* as the real victor. In chapter V of his book, Nicetas Choniates says that a chariot was built specially for this occasion; it was adorned with silver and precious stones and was drawn by four white horses. Instead of riding in it himself, the emperor yielded place to the eikon, attributing the victory to the Mother of God, his "invincible fellow-leader." The horses were led by the nobility, while the emperor, bearing a cross, headed the procession. The Abbé Joseph Lermann maintains (although the source of the story is unknown) that the *Hodegetria* was always conveyed in a white chariot drawn by white horses. Although the foundation for this theory is doubtful, such a custom may have existed, for the famous Iverian<sup>2</sup> eikon at Moscow was often conveyed round the city in such a vehicle for the visitation of homes of the sick who had called upon Our Lady for healing.

<sup>1</sup> Michel Psellos, *Chronographie*, Vol. I, p. 39. Edited by Emile Renauld, with a French translation, Paris, 1926. Société des Belles-Lettres. Two vols.

<sup>2</sup> A copy of the original, venerated on Mount Athos in the Iverian Monastery. The chapel of this eikon was destroyed by the Bolsheviks.

It is also interesting to note that at Freiburg in Switzerland, on a great feast day some years ago, the famous eikon of the Virgin of Bourguillon (Burgelen) was placed upon a kind of triumphal car, although this was in Latin territory and the people had no knowledge of the similarity of their action with the custom which prevailed at Constantinople in the days of the *Hodegetria*.

We are indebted to Nicetas Choniates for this story<sup>1</sup> of the emperor Isaac Angelos (1185—1195), when he was besieged at Constantinople by the usurper Branas: "He put upon the walls as an invincible armour and impregnable fortification, the image of the Mother of God belonging to the Monastery Hodegetria, from which its name is derived." With the help of the German king, Conrad, the emperor was indeed victorious.

While the Latins held Constantinople (1204—1261), they followed the example of the Greeks in their veneration of the *Hodegetria*. Indeed, so highly did they value possession of the eikon that friction arose between the Latins and the Greeks. The eikon was also a cause of jealousy between the Venetians and the Franks, when the former took it by force, bore it off to the monastery of Panteleïmon and refused to give it up until compelled to do so by Papal decree.

It may be that the Western custom of consecrating the Saturday of each week to Our Lady has some connection with the *Hodegetria*. Mediaeval Latin authors tell us—there is a poem dealing with this event written in Old French—that an image of the Blessed Virgin in Constantinople miraculously raised her veil every Saturday, thus indicating her desire that this day should be dedicated to her honour. This may have been the *Hodegetria*, since such a legend involving Byzantium would hardly find favour among the Latins unless it were during their occupation of the city. Also, the legend could not have originated among the Greeks, who have never set apart each Saturday in honour of Our Lady. We must remember, too, that the custom of dedicating each Saturday to Mary existed in the West long before Byzantium fell under Latin domination, but a legend such as this might have fostered the custom and brought forward a fresh argument in its favour.

In 1261 the Greeks reconquered Byzantium. Caesar Stratigopulos entered the city with a small force and put the

<sup>1</sup> Nicetas Choniates, *History*, I, 7. This author is to be found in *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. II, 2, p. 497.



Latin Emperor to flight. The Emperor Michael Palaeologos then made his solemn entry. According to the historian, Nicephorus Gregoras, he did not enter the city until the *Hodegetria* had first passed through the Golden Gate, followed by a procession singing hymns in praise of the Mother of God.<sup>1</sup> The same author relates how the emperor, Andronicos Palaeologos II, the Elder (1282—1328), was asked by his mother to set at liberty a political prisoner named Monomachos Mysticos, and how he granted her request but not before he had obtained from Mysticos a solemn promise, made before the *Hodegetria*, that he would thenceforth be his obedient subject.<sup>2</sup> From this we may gather that an oath taken before the eikon entailed the highest moral obligation. This same emperor, Andronicos II, had a long and scandalous quarrel with his grandson, Andronicos III (1328—1341). The same writer tells us how the grandson entered the city by night accompanied by his troops. His grandfather, aroused by the noise, rose from his bed in great fear. He had no attendants; except for his bodyguard of young men, the palace was empty. It so happened that the *Hodegetria* had been brought to the palace some time before at his desire.<sup>3</sup> He fell on his knees before it, in trepidation, praying that he might not die by the sword of his grandson. Not only was his prayer answered, but also the two were reconciled before the eikon<sup>4</sup>, and Andronicos III held the *Hodegetria* in great veneration until the end of his life. According to Nicephorus Gregoras<sup>5</sup> after he had won a victory over the Turks, he proceeded on foot from the battlefield to the palace, and, on the same night, to the church of the *Hodegetria* where he offered thanks for his

<sup>1</sup> History, 4, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 8, 4.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the eikon had been brought to the palace for the emperor's protection. On the other hand, it was the custom to transfer the eikon to the palace for the Easter Festival. According to George Kodinos, in chapter 12 of his work on the officials of the palace and the offices of the Church, it was taken to the palace on the fifth Thursday of Lent, which is a day of solemn penance in the Greek Church, when the canon of St. Andrew of Crete is solemnly sung. The emperor would receive the eikon at the door of the first vestibule of the palace, where it would remain until Easter Sunday. On Easter Monday, or on the Monday after the First Sunday after Easter, it would be taken back and the Emperor would accompany it to the place called *τὰ ὑψηλά*, where, before returning to the palace, he would commemorate the deceased emperors. (See also Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, Vol. 157.)

<sup>4</sup> Nicephorus Gregoras, History, 9, 6.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 2, 5.

victory. The same emperor, when death was approaching, went to the monastery of the *Hodegetria* in the hope, it may be, of being restored to health. He spent his last days there and died on June 15th, 1341.<sup>1</sup>

Constantine Ducas tells us<sup>2</sup> that during the last siege of Constantinople by the Turks, the *Hodegetria* was housed in the imperial palace during Easter Week, according to custom. From there it was taken to the monastery of Chora, probably because this was nearest the area most exposed to attack and where the defenders were in the greatest danger. There it remained until the conquest of the city by the Mohammedans.

From the time when the city fell under the domination of the Turks, the history of the original eikon ceases. Constantine Ducas<sup>3</sup> describes its fate. A band of Turkish soldiers entered the monastery of Chora and hacked the eikon to pieces with axes, each taking a part. There is a legend that the *Hodegetria* was carried by angels to heaven, and there is a popular Greek poem on the fall of Constantinople which contains a reference to this event.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, veneration for the *Hodegetria* did not cease with the destruction or disappearance of the original picture. Other eikons were similarly venerated and were carried with the army into battle. We know from Russian history that at different periods eikons accompanied the Russian army in time of war and that services were sometimes held before them—a custom which may have survived from the time of the *Hodegetria* in Byzantium. Also, there were many copies (either real or false) in different parts of the world which were venerated in the same way as was the original in Byzantium. There may be to this day, in some Orthodox countries, churches or monasteries which owe their dedication to the *Hodegetria*. There is known to be one copy of the eikon on Mount Athos, which was originally in the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., II, II. Andronicos II lived for some time after his grandson became emperor.

<sup>2</sup> *Byzantine History*, chapter 38.

<sup>3</sup> Constantine Ducas in Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, Vol. 157, chapter 39.

<sup>4</sup> See the Greek verses quoted in Ducange *Constantinopolis Christiana*. There were several instruments (either real or spurious) of Our Lord's passion preserved at Constantinople. A rough translation of the verse referred to runs as follows: "Where are the holy relics now? where are the sacred eikons?—the lady *Hodgeieria*, the Queen of all creation? 'Tis said that they were borne aloft to the heavenly regions—the relics and the instruments of the Saviour's passion. The angels hid them secretly near to the Ruler's throne."



Vatopedion Monastery but was later transferred to the Xenophon. It is commemorated on January 21st.<sup>1</sup>

There are several copies in Russia which are commemorated on July 28th; for example, that of Schua which is commemorated on July 28th in thanksgiving for deliverance from an epidemic of cholera, and on November 2nd for deliverance from the plague; that of the monastery of Voronin and that of the monk Christofer. The most famous of all is the *Hodegetria* of Smolensk, which is said to have been brought from Constantinople in very early days and to have been placed in the cathedral at Smolensk. Through its instrumentality the city is said to have been delivered from the Tartar hordes of Baty by a man named Merkurius who is venerated as a saint. In the fifteenth century it was housed for some time in the Be Gowestschenski Sobor (the cathedral of the Annunciation) at Moscow, but was later taken back to Smolensk. On that occasion the people of Moscow accompanied the eikon for part of the way, and on the spot where they left it a convent was erected in honour of the *Hodegetria* and a copy of the eikon was placed there. In the seventeenth century Smolensk was threatened and even, for a time, ceased to be in Russian hands. The *Hodegetria* was then moved to Moscow and later to Jaroslav. With the restoration of Smolensk, the eikon was brought back, not this time to the cathedral, but to the church of the *Hodegetria* which had been built there, and every year on July 28th there was a procession from the church to the cathedral in honour of the eikon. When the French, under Napoleon, occupied Smolensk in 1812, the eikon was again taken to Moscow and thence to Jaroslav, but with the fall of Napoleon, it was once again restored to the cathedral at Smolensk. A more modern copy of the eikon was kept at Smolensk and accompanied the Russian army to the battle of Borodino in 1812.<sup>2</sup>

The official synodal edition of the menaia of Moscow, 1904, contains, for July 28th, a solemn poetical office in honour of the *Hodegetria* of Smolensk. The canon was composed by the well-known Greek poet, Ignatius, and was translated into ecclesiastical Slavonic. It seems likely, therefore, that it was composed at Constantinople for the original *Hodegetria*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the account given in the book *Heavenly Protection of the Atho* Constantinople, 1861, pp. 97—98.

<sup>2</sup> Details concerning the Russian copies of the *Hodegetria* have been taken from Maltzev Menologion, Vol. II, pp. 621—625, Berlin, 1903.

In every troparion (strophe) of this canon Our Lady is called by the name *Hodegetria*. For instance, in Ode 7, i, troparion, the name *Hodegetria* is interpreted thus: "Rejoice, rejoice,<sup>1</sup> Queen *Hodegetria*, for thou teachest all faithful at all times to walk in all paths of salvation! Rejoice, Queen, it is by thee that we are always delivered from all barbarian aggression!" We do not know whether this custom and use still exist in present-day Russia.

In the Latin Church to-day some greatly venerated eikons are either real or false copies of the *Hodegetria*. Perhaps the most famous of all is the Virgin of Czestochowa (Poland) which has played an important part in the history of Poland.

In conclusion, we may say that the *Hodegetria*, to a greater extent than any other eikon, has influenced the veneration accorded to eikons by the faithful. If we would know what this devotion means in the life of the Orthodox, we have but to follow the history of this eikon, the *Hodegetria*, the Virgin of Guidance.

COMPILED BY G.P.

<sup>1</sup> The Greek salutation χαῖρε, meaning "rejoice," could as well be translated "Hail."



## EGYPT AND THE WEST

*Editor's note.*—These notes of the late Mr. Codrington have been found hidden away in a portfolio. We think they deserve publication and suggest they can be considered an addition to those already given in the E.C.Q. of October 1940 under the title *Egypt and the West. Liturgica.*

### FEASTS.

1. In the Coptic Synaxaria we find the following feasts of Our Lady :—

Conception : 7 Messori (July 31st) and 13 Khoiak (December 9th).

Nativity : 1 Pashons (April 26th) and 10 Thout (September 7th).

Death and Assumption : 21 Tobi (January 16th) and 16 Messori (August 9th).

The Coptic year consists of twelve months, each of 30 days, and a "little month" or "epagomenon" of five, or in leap-years of six, days. It begins on the Julian, August 29th. The names of the months are found in Western kalendars attached to the Roman months; thus Tobi is equated with January, Pashons with May, Messori with August, Thout with September and Khoiak with December. In the short table given above the Roman equivalents of the Coptic dates are the correct ones according to the Julian kalendar. It will be seen that the second feast in each case is taken from the Byzantine or Syrian kalendar. In the case of the Assumption the month of August has been taken by the Copts as identical with Messori; precisely similar mistakes occur elsewhere in the Synaxaria, as for instance the feast of St. George celebrated on 23 Pharmuthi or "April." For the difference of one day in the date of the Nativity, compare the Decollation of the Baptist kept on August 30th and St. Luke on October 19th.

Gregory of Tours, who died in 594, in *De gloria martyrum*, lib. i, cap. 9, speaks of a basilica of Our Lady built by Constantine, and says "huius festivitas sacra mediante mense undecimo celebratur," that is in the middle of January. This festival may have been that known later on in Gaul as the Depositio or Adsumptio, kept on the fifteenth of the kalends of February or in our reckoning on January 18th.

For the following Irish feasts or memorials the reader is referred to the late Mr. E. Bishop's "Feast of the Conception"

in *Liturgica Historica*, pp. 250 ff. Oengus, *circa* A.D. 800, gives these for Our Lady :—

January 18th, Death; May 3rd, "The great feast of the Virgin Mary"; July 1st, "Mary whom Matthew magnifies"; August 15th, "The great feast of her commemoration"; August 16th, Nativity; September 8th, "Thou shalt commemorate Mary."

The Martyrology of Tallagt (ninth-tenth century) has the Dormitio on January 18th, the Conception on May 3rd (repeated on May 7th), the Assumption and the Nativity on August 14th and 16th respectively, and the last named festival again on September 8th. The metrical kalendar (tenth century) has the Conception on May 2nd.

Oengus also has for April 1st "one of Mary's feasts," which Bishop does not identify; it may perhaps be that of Mary of Egypt, kept by the Copts on 6 Pharmuthi (April 1st). But the Tallagt Martyrology makes it to be the Nativity. So far the Irish sources.

The Epternach Martyrology, *circa* 720, has the Depositio on January 18th and the Nativity on August 16th. The Bobbio Missal, *circa* 700, has two Masses immediately following that of the Chair of St. Peter, namely "in sanctae Mariae solemnitate" and "in Adsumptione sanctae Mariae."

We thus find, so far as *dates* go, the following coincidences between Coptic and Western feasts :—

#### COPTIC.

- 1 Pashons, "May," Nativity.
- 21 Tobi (January 16th), Assumption.
- 16 Messori, "August," Assumption.

#### WESTERN.

May 2nd, 3rd, the great feast of the Virgin Mary; Conception.  
January 18th, Death, Depositio, Assumption.  
August 16th, Nativity.

The Syrian Jacobites have a feast of Our Lady "over the seeds" on January 15th. This, however, seems to be Edesene rather than Antiochene; it does not appear in the kalendars of British Museum Add. 17134 (seventh century) and Add. 14504 (ninth century). The Gallican feast in January, therefore, if of foreign origin, may have Egyptian rather than Syrian affinities.



2. In the Coptic Synaxaria the festivals of the Cross are often connected with St. Helena. Thus on 16 Thout (September 13th) are commemorated Helena and the dedication of the church of the Anastasis, and on the next day the Holy Cross. On 9 Pashons (May 4th) they keep the death of St. Helena, the entry in Ludolf's Ethiopic kalendar being "Helena reperit crucem." But whether this is more than a coincidence with the Western feast of the Invention on May 3rd, commemorating its recovery by Heraclius, is very doubtful.

Oengus for March 10th has "Constantine, by whom the Cross was found." The Coptic Synaxaria on 10 Phamenoth ("March") mention the Finding of the Cross, first by Helena, secondly by Heraclius. This may be accidental, but the Finding is coupled with the memorial of the Emperor Constantine in the two old Syrian kalendars, already mentioned, on May 22nd, the feast which corresponds with the Byzantine one of Constantine and Helena on the previous day.

3. We now come to borrowings by Egypt from the West. On 14 Hathor (November 10th) the Copts keep Martinus (variants, Martius or Cyrinus), bishop of Tarâkyâ (variants, Pharacha, Thrace). The saint is said to have been born at Safâryah, contended with the Arians, taken refuge on the seacoast, and then to have become bishop. R. Basset, the editor of the Synaxarion in *Patrologia Orientalis*, III, identifies him with St. Martin of Tours, who was born at Sabaria in Pannonia and after troubles with the Arians went to the seacoast of Liguria before becoming bishop. The Byzantine Menology of the Emperor Basil has St. Martin of Tours on November 12th. The legend differs entirely from the Coptic. But he is styled "bishop of Phrangia," i.e. Francia, and this word may lie behind the Arabic name of the see.

4. Vansleb in his *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie* (1677) gives among the Coptic feasts of Our Lady, some of which were local, one of her giving the pontifical habit to St. "Dekisius." This feast does not appear in the Synaxaria which I have consulted. It is found, however, in the Ethiopic Synaxarion under 22 Takhshash (December 18th) thus: "Dequesius bishop of Teltelyâ to whom Mary gave heavenly apparel because he wrote the account of the miracle of her Annunciation." The main festival of the day, both in the Coptic and in the Ethiopic books, is of St. Gabriel (Gabriel angel of the Annunciation, Gabriel and memorial of the

Annunciation). Vansleb (p. 159) identifies "Dekisius" with St. Ildephonsus, who according to the legend received a chasuble from Our Lady as a reward for writing in defence of her perpetual virginity. The identification doubtless is correct. It will be observed that the date, December 18th, is that of the Mozarabic feast of the Annunciation, now the Expectation of Our Lady. The Ethiopic Synaxarion is from the Arabic and corruption in names is to be expected where, as in that script, many letters are differentiated only by dots, and vowels usually are not indicated. It is easy for d.f.nsûs to become d.q.syûs, the f and n being distinguishable from q and y only by different dots, while ns without the diacriticals differ from sy only by the spacing. The dropping of the *Il*, taken as the Arabic definite article, should cause no difficulty; it is left out in Iskandar, the Arabic form of Alexander. The Spanish Arabic name of Toledo is Tulitalah (t.lt.îl.h.), the name of the see of St. "Dequesius" is Teltelyâ (t.lt.lyâ); the double t is the same cerebral letter in both names. St. Ildephonsus died in 667. The constant intercourse between Muslim Spain and the Levant sufficiently accounts for the travelling of the legend to Egypt.

The borrowing of a Western feast or feasts by the Copts seems to be clear enough. Whether the Westerns borrowed from Egypt is not so certain. The Coptic months, as already said, appear in our kalendars and borrowing is not impossible. It perhaps may be accounted for by the influence of Egyptian monasticism. Tradition given in an account of the various *cursus* of the psalmody (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, LXXII, 605 ff.) held that the *cursus* "qui dicitur praesente tempore Scottorum" was that used by St. Mark and traced its history in the West through Cassian, St. Honoratus, St. Caesarius, St. Lupus, St. Germanus, St. Patrick and others down to St. Columban. Traces of the feasts of Our Lady in the Irish books might be expected to be found in Spain, but so far as I know this is not the case. The January festival is Gallican, not Spanish.

H. W. CODRINGTON.

## CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

We have made no real attempt to give a chronicle since the January—June number of 1942. We then recorded the most important documents concerning our subject that came to hand. They dealt with the year 1942. In considering Russia we gave some comments of two Russian Orthodox well acquainted with the U.S.S.R., as some interpretation of events there. This present chronicle, while recounting facts, will concern itself more with tendencies, specially bearing in mind that main object of the review, Christian unity.

### Rome

On June 29, 1943, the Pope published his encyclical letter "Mystici Corporis Christi." We will deal with this in detail in a future issue of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*.

The Vatican is distributing large quantities of New Testaments in various languages in the camps of prisoners of war. Some of the young Russians have a chance to read the Scriptures for the first time. Serbs have been receiving Bibles both from the patriarchate at Belgrade and the Vatican.<sup>1</sup>

### Jesuits of the Byzantine Rite

In our last issue mention was made of some newly ordained priests of the Russian College in Rome. The following is a record of two alumni of this college, one in the far East, the other in the far West.

The latest news of Father Wilcock in Shanghai<sup>2</sup> is dated September, 1943. The three priests of St. Michael's College, Fathers Wilcock, Milner and Meyers, have been moved to the big French Jesuit mission of Zi-Ka-Wei on the outskirts of Shanghai. But the college still goes on with a temporary staff, a French Jesuit as official director with an Irish Franciscan, three Salesians and an Irish Columban father doing the ordinary school work, while the old Russian archimandrite looks after the Russian Catholic parish. The three Jesuits are simply segregated, which does not involve any harsh conditions and few restrictions. The college seems to be flourishing and

<sup>1</sup> *Stephen Graham's News Letter*, March, 1943.

<sup>2</sup> From the *Report of the Russian Mission in Shanghai*, April, 1944.



one at least of the boys hopes to be a priest and return to Russia.

We also hear that at St. George's College, now at Paris (once of Namur), Père Mailleux is carrying on the same work. This of course is the parent Jesuit school for Russian boys.

In the report from Father Ryder in Los Angeles, California,<sup>1</sup> the outstanding events seem to be the formation of a choir from his own parish, and that a Canadian Jesuit cleric has joined the Russian mission. There is nothing conspicuous to mention from these three Russian Catholic centres—there is simply the steady work which they hope one day may bear fruit on Russian soil.

The words of Pope Pius XI when addressing the students at the Russian College in Rome in March, 1938, should be an encouragement :

“The day will come when things will go as God desires them to, not as men have desired. . . . In the end events obey, not the thought and the hand of man, but the thought and hand of God.”

## U.S.A.

The sixty annual Conference on Eastern Rites, sponsored by Fordham University, was held in New York this spring. The general topic this year was The Problem of Church Unity, and it was developed by three principal speakers, the Very Rev. James H. Griffiths, S.T.D., chancellor of the military ordinariate, the Rev. Joseph M. Egan, S.T.D., formerly professor of church history and patrology at Dunwoodie seminary, and Miss Helen Isvolsky.

The chief act of worship of the conference was a solemn Liturgy according to the Armenian rite, celebrated in St. Patrick's cathedral. The celebrant was Father Pascal Maljian, pastor of Armenian Catholics in New York. The Archbishop of New York presided at the throne, supported by the Bishop of Ogdensburg and the auxiliary army bishop; the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch was represented by the Archimandrite Bernard Ghosn and the Maronite Patriarch by the Chorepiscopus Louis Zuain. Numerous prelates and other clergy of Eastern and Western rites were present, and over three thousand lay people crowded the cathedral. A sermon on Armenia's most ancient contribution to Christianity and the numerous

<sup>1</sup> *Mission Jottings*, August—December, 1943.

martyrs of that people was preached by the Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S.R.D.

## ORTHODOX NEWS

### Greece

Since the beginning of the war with Italy the Greek Orthodox Church has been helping the needy population through work in the homes, an employment exchange, medical service, etc. This was begun by Metropolitan Khrysanthos of Athens. After the German occupation Mgr. Khrysanthos was succeeded by the Metropolitan Damaskinos who carries on the same work. The 139 parishes of the capital have become welfare centres. Food is also being distributed in the families themselves. In the afternoon people of 14 to 18 are brought together in the parish centres. This forms a starting point for a re-education of Greek youth. The Zoe Movement is giving active help.<sup>1</sup>

The Theological Faculty of Athens has lost two of its leading professors, Constantine Dyovouniotis, theologian, who has died, and Demeter Balanos, patrologist, who has retired.<sup>2</sup> The Metropolitan Panteleimon of Karystia escaped to the Middle East at the end of October, 1943. The Greek newspaper *The National Herald* of New York published his account of conditions in Greece. Throughout the country the clergy, bishops, abbots and ordinary priests, are showing themselves the leaders of the people and for this reason are singled out by the enemy for reprisals—often torture and death. The Church and the people are one.<sup>3</sup>

The German controlled Athens Radio 10—10.43 (Home Service, 13.30), said that the aim of the Kremlin is to set up Slavonic states, including Greece, Albania and Yugoslavia, in south-eastern Europe. *The Tablet* of April 15, 1944, has an article on the work of the communist minority in Greece and the present crisis in the Greek government.

### Yugoslavia

The monastery of Zhicha (early thirteenth century) is visited daily by many people. It has suffered very badly—the altar gates, where St. Sava is reputed once to have stood and given his blessing—have been destroyed. While the Partisans were

<sup>1</sup> See *Orthodox Church Bulletin* July, 1943.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, September, 1943.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, December, 1943.

in control there, the monastery was subject to a series of forced loans and is now very impoverished. But the church of St. Sava still remains intact and so does the school.

The body of Prince Lazar, who was killed at the battle of Kossovo in the fourteenth century, has been moved from a monastery near Krushevat. The Germans have conveyed it to the cathedral at Belgrade. There is a constant stream of visitors to the shrine.<sup>1</sup>

In April, under the eyes of the invaders, the Serbian Orthodox clergy held their first congress at Bosanska Krajina. They declared that, "There is no excuse for bishops, clergy or ordinary people to collaborate with the occupying powers. . . . Differences of religion must be no longer a cause of discord between the people of Yugoslavia. In the course of the present war, the brotherhood of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Moslems has been sealed with blood. In the struggle for national liberation the people of Yugoslavia has cemented its brotherhood with the people of the Soviet Union. They send greetings to the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union."<sup>2</sup>

Bishop Dionisy, head of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the U.S.A. and Canada, in a document dated St. Nicholas's day, 1942, denounces the "Croatian Orthodox Church" set up by the "quisling" Ante Pavelich. He takes this step "in the name of the Serbian Orthodox Church, as her only free bishop in the world," and adds that he has sent an appeal to the four patriarchs and to the autonomous Orthodox churches.<sup>3</sup> The Vatican does not recognise the "Independent Croatian State."

We have the statement of Mr. Stephen Graham that Drazha Mihailovich has the backing of the whole of the Serb Orthodox Church.<sup>4</sup> This raises the question, what of Marshal Tito and his followers? Here one is only concerned with the good of religion, and in this connection we have such statements as: "the number of Orthodox clergy working with Tito's partisans is quite considerable. Patriarch Sergius (of Moscow) sent them his blessing and encouragement as long ago as last April. . . . The Croatian papers published some time ago a warning to the Orthodox peasants of Gudinci in the Djakovo

<sup>1</sup> S.G.N.L., February, 1943.

<sup>2</sup> *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, July, 1943.

<sup>3</sup> *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, May, 1943.

<sup>4</sup> *Stephen Graham News Letter*, March, 1943.



district, threatening them with dire punishments if they joined the guerillas, who are chiefly Orthodox.”<sup>1</sup>

*The Tablet* in December of last year said that : “ What is to-day an organised army began as a number of unconnected groups, which varied greatly in character. Some undoubtedly were entirely communist, hating the Church and doing violence to her priests ; but these were a minority, and it does not appear that they predominate to-day. At no time has any prelate made any statement hostile to or critical of the movement as a whole.”<sup>2</sup> Speaking of the deeply religious Slovenes the article goes on to say : “ These are some of the men now with Tito ; others are Third-Internationalists, of course ; but the Catholics are in vastly greater proportion than were, for instance, the Catholic Basques in the councils of Republican Spain, and should therefore be very much better able to make their influence felt. A large part of the non-communist personnel of Tito’s movement comes from the Croat Peasant party. . . .” This is speaking for the Catholics of Yugoslavia.

On March 25 of this year, *The Tablet* in an article entitled “Yugoslavia after Three Years,” published further conclusions on the position. The correspondent writes : “ As in the sixteenth century, so to-day also, the peasants are rising as a bulwark of Christian belief to defend against every totalitarian enemy the rights of man and those principles from which true democracy is derived. Their only wish is to be assured that the British Empire and the United States are still with them.” The article goes on to show that there is considerable division among the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It is not the old religious and racial division, but a division cutting right across the older one, between those who are loyal to the King on the one hand, and to Marshal Tito on the other. The prestige of the King is high ; but that of his government is low, largely because of the constant changes of membership in the past three years. There is, however, recent proof of much confidence in one member of it ; that man is General Mihailovich. He has been in the field since March 1941, and has been minister of war since January, 1942. The general is a representative Serb, and is violently opposed to the communists associated with Tito. At the national congress that he held in January, the leader of the Social Democratic party

<sup>1</sup> Serge Bolshakoff in *The Bulletin*, March, 1944.

<sup>2</sup> “ The Catholic Church and Tito’s Army.” *The Tablet*, December 18th, 1943.

and a representative of the Yugoslav Radical party were present. The writer goes on to say that the greater part of Dr. Macek's Croat Peasant party and the Serbian Democratic block are not with Tito. On the other hand the communists (whom the writer says exclusively control Tito's movements) are making a bid for power in Slovenia, and the Catholic bishop of Ljubljana, Mgr. Gregory Rozman, warns his flock in a pastoral letter.

It is learnt that Antiono Tepez, vice-president of *Pax Romana* was shot at his house. Many priests have been assassinated.

## Rumania

At the present time Hungary, having wrested territories from Rumania and Yugoslavia, and so having taken over a large Orthodox (as well as Byzantine Catholic) population, contemplates (or contemplated) the erection of a Hungarian Orthodox church<sup>1</sup>.

The Patriarch Nicodemus presided at the meeting of the synod at Bukarest. He has requested the appointment of a patriarchal vicar to help him.

The Metropolitan Vissarion has consecrated several new churches in Odessa, but it is not clear whether these are for Russian or Rumanian Orthodox.

At Feldiora a church for Russian prisoners of war was consecrated in the presence of the Rumanian metropolitan, Balan. The Rumanian bishop took an optimistic view of the revival of Christianity in the Soviet Union. The Russian prisoners, he said, would return to their homes "with faith in their hearts and a cross on their breasts."

The papal nuncio, Mgr. Cassulo, recently visited Odessa to collect information about the welfare of the population there, as well as of the Soviet prisoners.

Rumanian Catholic bishops of the Byzantine rite are playing a leading part in the campaign for a united Christian effort. The Orthodox Rumanian Patriarch in his Christmas message deprecated a war of aggression, but praised the sacred duty of defending one's country.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Stephen Graham's News Letter*, February, 1943. Already in 1935 the Ecumenical Patriarch informed the Patriarchs at Belgrade and Buckarest that he proposed erecting an autonomous Orthodox church in Hungary.

<sup>2</sup> The above was gathered together from *Stephen Graham's News Letter*, September, October and November, 1943. *The Eastern Churches Broad-sheet*, March. 1944.

## Bulgaria

The Bulgarian Church is working to establish a patriarchate for the whole of Bulgaria. The president of the holy synod is the Metropolitan Neophyt.<sup>1</sup>

The Archimandrite Stefan from Skoplo was invited by the Germans to visit occupied Russia. A conference of the Orthodox clergy in occupied Russia took place in Smolensk with permission of the Germans. The cathedral was crowded.<sup>2</sup>

## U.S.S.R.

In the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, July—December, 1943, we gave full notice of the restoration of the Moscow patriarchate. Here is some information about the reaction to this move from various Orthodox centres. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem have sent their congratulations to Patriarch Sergius. The election was bound to produce a reply from the Russian prelates in the occupied countries who, in some cases no doubt under duress, have co-operated with the Germans. The restoration has not only increased unrest in the German-occupied Russia, but has actively promoted the partisan movement in Yugoslavia. It has strengthened, too, the pro-soviet elements in Rumania, Bulgaria and even Hungary.

A good many Orthodox clergy have begun to change their attitude to the Soviet régime. The Germans called upon all the Russian bishops living in their territories to declare their view on the subject. Some thirty prelates assembled at Vienna on October 16 and declared the election invalid at canon law: the synod considered the election to be a political move only. Archbishop Anastasy presided over this meeting. The synod of the Polish Orthodox Church and the Metropolitan of Lithuania have also refused to recognize the election to be anything but a political move.

Some of the Russian bishops of North America assembled at Detroit on October 27, and decided to acknowledge the new patriarch and to mention his name in the Liturgy.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, January—June and July—December, 1943.

<sup>2</sup> S.B. in *The Bulletin*, September, 1943.

<sup>3</sup> See *The Eastern Churches Broadsheet*, February, 1944. Also see Sir Paul Duke's article, "Soviet Devolution," in *The Tablet*, February 12th, 1944.



An Orthodox theological institute has been established in Moscow. A very thorough course of studies is planned: Holy Scripture; the study of the fathers, both Greek and Latin; Church history; liturgy; Greek and Latin; and the reading of foreign theological, apologetic and polemical literature, Catholic, Protestant and Anglican.<sup>1</sup>

On November 28, 1943, the Patriarch announced at Moscow the reconciliation between himself and his church with the Katholikos of Georgia, and his church. In February, 1917 the Church of Georgia had separated itself from the Russian Church, and the Russians refused to recognize this act.<sup>2</sup>

There is some news from Orthodox missions among the Moslem peoples of the Volga and in Central Asia, and in the Soviet republics in Tartar territory. Some of the converts hold responsible positions in these republics. The state of Orthodoxy in the Soviet Yakut and Burgat-Mongol republics is reported flourishing. There are at present two Orthodox dioceses in Central Asia.<sup>3</sup>

## Poland

There have been two excellent articles on Poland in *The Tablet*. "The Catholic Church in Eastern Poland" (December 11, 1943) gives a fully historical as well as present-day picture of the Catholics in Eastern Poland of the Latin, Byzantine, and Armenian rites. The other is, "Russia and Poland," by T. Charles Edwards, a very necessary outlining of the historical background if one is to see the Russian as well as the Polish view.

## London

On December 4, 1943, Archbishop Germanos, exarch in Central and Western Europe of the Patriarch of Constantinople, celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of his appointment to this post. The Archbishop is also *apokrisarios* (legate) to Lambeth.<sup>4</sup> Two weeks later, the first *apokrisarios* of the Serbian Patriarch, the Archpriest Zivoin Ristanovich, was received by the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *O.C.B.*, March, 1944.

<sup>2</sup> *O.C.B.*, April, 1944.

<sup>3</sup> *The Eastern Churches Broadsheet*, February, 1944.

<sup>4</sup> *The Eastern Churches Broadsheet*, January, 1944.

## U.S.A.

The newly-organized Federated Orthodox Primary Jurisdiction in America is planning to establish a special English-speaking seminary for Orthodox students from Europe. One object will be that when priests trained at the seminary return to their countries they will help further the good will and understanding between the Church in America and in Europe. The federation held its first convention on December 12 in Chicago, during which the Archimandrite Theodore Tukutchoev was consecrated first Russian Orthodox bishop of the Argentine. The federation at present embraces the dioceses of the Syrian, Russian, Serbian, Ukrainian, Carpatho-Russian and Rumanian Orthodox Churches. In the cases of the Metropolitan Benjamin (exarch of the Patriarchate of Moscow) and Bishop Dionisy of the Serbian Church, membership is at present unofficial, pending approval of the heads of their churches. Archbishop Athenagoras is the presiding bishop of the federation.

There are said to be over 5,000,000 Orthodox believers (this figure seems very over-stated), with 25 bishops and 1,500 priests in the U.S.A. There are 155 students at present in the three Orthodox seminaries in the country. There are said to be 400,000 Orthodox serving in the armed forces.<sup>2</sup>

The federation of Orthodox Churches in Europe as elsewhere may be the solution of many of the post-war problems.

It is materialistic Communism, Marxism, that has been condemned by the Church (by the Popes and also in theory by the Patriarch Sergius). There seem to be two ways in which Christians may combat a materialist totalitarian state. One is by martyrdom; and the other is for the Christian Church to become a state within a state, and so, by the grace and power of the Spirit, to conquer. Both ways were used in turn in early Christian ages. The first has till now been the lot of Christians in the U.S.S.R. (as also under the nazis in Germany). What of the future? "For the peace of the whole world, for the good estate of the holy Churches of God, and for the unity of them all, let us beseech the Lord." (Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom).

<sup>1</sup> *The Orthodox Church Bulletin*, January, 1944.

<sup>2</sup> *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, January, 1944.

## GREAT BRITAIN

**The Sword of the Spirit**

The Archbishop of Westminster has kindly consented to become president of the "Sword of the Spirit."

Mr. A. C. F. Beales reports the total number of local Christian councils to be fifty to the end of the year 1943.<sup>1</sup> What sort of Christian co-operation is visualized is made clear by a joint statement drawn up on January 24, 1942, and ratified by the two committees, i.e., by the Sword of the Spirit on February 5, and by the Commission of the Churches ("Religion and Life") on April 15 of the same year. We quote the relevant paragraphs from this document:—"We are all profoundly impressed with the increasing danger that in our generation the Christian heritage, in which we all share, may be lost, and that our country may increasingly slip into accepting pagan standards and ideals. Believing, as we do, that the Christian revelation has an intrinsic claim upon mankind, and that it is also the preserver of human society from excesses and errors, we feel that all Christians are bound in duty and charity alike towards their fellow-countrymen to oppose the present tendencies to set Christianity aside and to treat it as a matter of private concern without relevance to the principles which should guide society.

"We agree that there is a large area of common ground on which, without raising ultimate questions of church order and doctrine which divide us, full co-operation is possible and is already taking place. The Church of England, the Church of Scotland and the Evangelical Free Churches have already co-operated for some considerable time in the social and international field. There has also been, for more than twenty years, co-operation for limited social purposes with the Roman Catholic Church. But the first clear definition of a large common area is to be found in the ten points of *The Times* letter of December 21, 1940, which was signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Hinsley and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council.

"The joint declaration in *The Times* letter is a valuable point of departure. But there are many other pronouncements, such as that issued by the Malvern Conference, the document on social justice and economic reconstruction issued by the

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin*, February 3rd, 1944.



Commission of the Churches, the statement on a Christian realm put out by the Church Union of the Church of England, the social encyclical letters of the popes from Leo XIII onwards, and many others, all relevant to the common obligation we accept. Over this whole field, collaboration among Christians, already in progress, ought to be encouraged.

"We agree that organized Christianity, to fulfil its proper function, must everywhere be secured in certain essential freedoms. Full freedom must mean freedom to worship according to conscience, freedom to preach, teach, educate and persuade (all in the spirit of Christian charity), and freedom to bring up children in the faith of their parents. The Christian life is one lived in and through membership of a religious society, and its corporate nature and its constitutional freedom and independence must be recognized and guaranteed by the state."

In the same issue of the *Bulletin* both the good and the dangers of co-operation are well considered by the Rev. Thomas Fitzgerald.<sup>1</sup>

### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

*Christian Unity and Church Reunion.* This is the Presidential address delivered in full synod to the Convocation of Canterbury on May 25, 1943, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Temple emphasises that the only kind of common Christian witness which is possible "while our ecclesiastical divisions remain" is that of Christian co-operation; and he mentions the British Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Sword of the Spirit. As to the importance of this united Christian witness he leaves no doubt: "That there is need for the most effective witness to Christian moral and social principles is very plain. The Christian tradition is challenged from without more powerfully than in any period since the end of the dark ages, and is in danger of being undermined by a secular humanism which hopes to retain Christian values without Christian faith. If then there is special need for effective Christian witness, and if one condition of maximum effectiveness is that we give that witness unitedly, a refusal or failure to unite for this purpose would be a betrayal of trust, it would be a refusal or failure to serve not only the people of our generation but our Lord Himself."

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin*, June 4th, 1942.

<sup>2</sup> This is published by the S.P.C.K., price 4d.

Here every Catholic would agree with the Archbishop, but not so with the issue of the address. This is a consideration of the Orders of the Free Church Ministry. The present issue has been forced on Convocation by the proximity of the South Indian Scheme. Dr. Temple does not discuss the Indian proposals in any detail but falls back on the English terms of agreement drawn up by the Anglican and Free Church representatives on May 29, 1922. Since then there have been the World Conferences on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927 and at Edinburgh in 1937.

We quote an extract from the memorandum of the Anglican representatives (comprising all the leading bishops) in connection with the above agreement. The bishops first disclaim that they are giving any *official* interpretation; they then say that the ministries of which they speak are non-episcopal ministries, "which rest upon a long-established order, which have been conferred by some solemn and authoritative act implying ordination to the ministry of the Universal Church and not merely commission to the ministry of a particular denomination and which are regarded as involving a life-long vocation. . . . Such Free Church ministries we find it impossible to regard as 'invalid,' that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been divinely ordained in the Church of Christ." And they add, "yet ministries even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective." They then quote the preface to the Anglican ordinal and continue: "Thus the Anglican Church is bound to secure the authorization of its ministers for its own congregations, and no one could be authorized to exercise his ministry among them who had not been episcopally ordained.

- " 1. We regard the rule quoted above as much more than a rule of internal discipline. It embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered, and which contribute to the special position which it claims to hold in the Catholic Church.
- " 2. We cannot lose sight of the relations in which we stand to other episcopal churches in East and West; nor can we ignore the danger of creating pain and disturbance, or even the possibility of schism, within our own communion if the rule and principle contained in the Ordinal were to be set aside."

The Anglican representatives then went on to recommend

conditional ordination. Yet in spite of this Dr. Temple, while making clear his own personal faith concerning Anglican orders, makes this statement: "Are we entitled to say of any ministry transmitted by other than the channels familiar for centuries to the whole Church that they have been 'blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit' and are 'within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church'? I cannot doubt that we are both entitled and obliged to make such a judgement. And if we thus judge that the Holy Spirit has blessed and owned these ministries, can we without presumption and profanity refuse to recognize them ourselves?"

Here let us consider the Orthodox Churches of the East to whom the Anglican Church has been making official approach for many years and especially recently. Here is the attitude of the Orthodox to the non-episcopal ministries of the Free Churches. In the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in 1927, the conference considering the ministry of the Church was summarized thus: "The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church. . . . The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments to be made effective by faith." The Orthodox representatives formulated the following: "The Orthodox Church, regarding the ministry as instituted in the Church by Christ Himself, and as the body which by a special *charisma* is the organ through which the Church spreads its means of grace such as the sacraments, and believing that the ministry in its three-fold form of bishops, presbyters, and deacons can only be based on the unbroken apostolic succession, regrets that it is unable to come, in regard to the ministry, into some measure of agreement with many of the churches represented at this conference.<sup>1</sup>

In the report of the second world conference, held at Edinburgh in 1937, the Orthodox delegates repeated the above statement that they gave at Lausanne, and added the following in regard to the validity of sacraments: "According to the Orthodox doctrine valid sacraments are only those which are administered by a canonically ordained and instituted minister and rightly performed according to the sacramental order of the Church. They regard it therefore as unnecessary

<sup>1</sup> *Reports of the World Conference on Faith and Order*, Lausanne, August 3rd to 21st, 1927, pp. 19 and 13.



to accept any other document on this matter presented by the conference."<sup>1</sup>

It will not be out of place here to give the conditions put down by the late Dr. Khrestos Androustos (of the University of Athens) for the Orthodox acceptance of Anglican orders :

- " 1. The outward or canonical apostolic succession must be demonstrated to have been maintained unbroken.
- " 2. The inward or dogmatic succession must also have been maintained."

He then asks four questions to satisfy himself as to the second :

- " 1. Does the Anglican Church hold that the apostolic episcopate is the supreme organ of the Church? Are its dogmatic decisions incontrovertible for the faithful? And are its canonical enactments binding *eo ipso* upon them?
- " 2. Does it hold that in holy orders a *charisma* is given and received by the laying-on of hands with prayer?
- " 3. Does it hold that in the Eucharist the bread and wine become the body and the blood of the Lord? And that in the Eucharist the bloodless sacrifice of Golgotha is offered for the whole Church, both for the living and the dead?
- " 4. Does it teach that the priest has power and authority to absolve sins?"<sup>2</sup>

This is sufficient to consider the position from the point of view of the Orthodox, and this includes of course the Russian Church!

Passing from consideration of the general attitude to the Free Church ministry to the particular case of the South India Scheme, which has already produced a spate of literature and letters to the press both for and against. It has now reached the stage when final decisions are to be taken, hence the importance of considering some of this literature. We have before us :

- i. *The South India Scheme of Union and the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.* February, 1942. (S.P.C.K.)

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order.* Edinburgh, August 3rd to 18th, 1937, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Christian East*, September, 1935, p. 43; this is also reviewed in the *E.C.Q.*, April, 1936, pp. 53—57. For more complete examination of Orthodox teaching and Anglican commitments on this subject see the second part of "The Orthodox and Anglican Orders," *E.C.Q.*, April, 1937.

- ii. *Open Letter to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion.* (The Church Union).
- iii. *The South Indian Church.* Letter by the Bishop of Gloucester to *The Church Times*. May 21, 1943.
- iv. *Reunion by Destruction*<sup>1</sup>, by T. S. Eliot. (The Council for the Defence of Church Principles, No. 7).
- v. *Christian Unity and Church Unity*, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.
- vi. *The Unity of the Faith* (May 25, 1943). An Open Letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from the Superiors of certain Religious Communities. (November 4, 1943).

These should give us an objective view of the whole position.

First, then, the main principles of the Scheme are given thus :—

That Holy Scripture be accepted as the decisive standard of the faith. The Apostles' and Nicene creeds are sufficient statements of the essential articles of belief, together with agreed statements on the sacraments and the nature of the ministry.

That in the United Church there shall be a genuine combination of episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements, the historic episcopate in a constitutional form being accepted as part of the basis of union, together with a system of church government which confers large powers on the rest of the clergy and on laymen in the councils of the Church, etc.

That the United Church shall continue to maintain those relations of fellowship and intercommunion with other churches which are now maintained severally with those churches by the uniting churches.

That after the consummation of union all ordinations shall be episcopal. They do not, however, commit the Church to any particular interpretation of episcopacy. That there will be an interim period after the inauguration of the union, and during that period there will be a dual ministry, some ministers ordained by bishops, others to the ministry of non-episcopal churches. (Summarized from *document i*, pp. 12, 13).<sup>2</sup>

*Document ii* is signed by Sir George Arthur and Bishop

<sup>1</sup> We believe the<sup>2</sup> Bishop of Norwich has recently answered this.

<sup>2</sup> This pamphlet, edited by Bishops Western and Palmer, contains resolutions passed and documents issued in February, 1942, copies of which together with the scheme are being laid before the diocesan councils.

Rocksborough Smith as president and secretary of the Church Union, and by Father W. B. O'Brien, S.S.J.E., chairman of the Council for the Defence of Church Principles. It sets out to show that "if the text of the scheme be carefully studied, it will be seen that such agreement as is expressed by the acceptance of the historic episcopate, episcopal ordination, the sacraments of baptism and holy communion, the Apostles' and Nicene creeds and synodical government is only made possible by the deliberate refusal to define the sense in which these terms are used, or the nature of the acceptance given to them. Indeed, it will be found in one instance after another that those with whom the Anglicans have been negotiating have, in consistency with their own beliefs, protected themselves from the acceptance of these fundamentals in any adequately Catholic sense, and from any reference to the authority of the Catholic Church which alone can make them fundamental" (pp. 2 and 3).

It also shows that "the scheme provides that the ministers of those bodies with which the Anglicans are uniting will continue to minister in the Church of South India and will be fully authorized to do so without episcopal ordination. It also especially provides that, whatever changes may be made in the constitution of the Church after thirty years (such changes might take the form of the abandonment of episcopal ordination), the rights of these ministers and apparently of visiting ministers from the parent bodies to exercise their ministry in the Church of South India without episcopal ordination shall be safeguarded" (p. 5).

The writers also make this important point, that "it is impossible to treat the scheme for union in South India as an isolated phenomenon designed to meet an emergency in one corner of the mission field. It must be recognized as providing a new technique for overcoming the initial difficulty of bringing together those who have grown so far apart in their Christian thought that the one cannot even understand the principles which are sacred to the other. The scheme has thus become the recognized pioneer of a movement which is making itself felt throughout the whole Anglican communion. It is no longer a question of a great need or a great opportunity in South India; it is something which, if it succeeds, will profoundly change the whole Anglican communion, both in itself and in its relations to the Roman and Orthodox communions and to all Protestant bodies" (p. 9).



Here is where the answer of the bishop of Gloucester should be quoted (i.e., *Document iii*). With the first part we are not concerned. The bishop does not view the scheme as the writers of the open letter do, and he considers the sacraments and the two creeds sufficiently safeguarded, though he does not meet the charges raised in *document ii*. But it is the last part of the letter that interests us. The bishop writes: "It is suggested that this scheme will injure our relations with the Orthodox Church. I do not think so. It is significant that while several branches of that church have recognized the validity of Anglican orders, that was mainly done under the influence of the Patriarch Meletius, who was of opinion that the Church might in accordance with the principle of economy declare the validity of those who have not been episcopally ordained. That is the opinion of some Orthodox theologians, but not of the majority." We will set beside this statement the relevant part of the statement which Patriarch Meletius made, on his return from London in 1930, to his holy synod at Alexandria. It was translated from *Pantaenos* (of December 11 and December 18, 1930) by Canon J. H. Douglas and printed in *The Christian East* (Winter 1930—31). The Patriarch says: "The matter under consideration touched the very existence of Christianity in India where the leaders of the churches have announced their conviction that church unity is a necessity for the progress of the Gospel and that otherwise the ground which has been gained is in danger of being lost. To bring about that unity, they were agreed on the one hand that on union the existing ministers of the Protestant churches should be accepted without reordination, on the condition that no one in future should enter upon the ministry of the sacraments without ordination by an Anglican bishop, but on the other hand that the tendency of the scheme should be to secure the predominance of the faith and practice of the Anglican church. Those Anglicans who advocated the acceptance of the scheme emphasized the fact that their objective was, through a timely concession by economy, to establish permanently on the basis of Anglican dogma that unity which is vitally necessary. The question was burning and it was on account of it that occasion arose for the discussion of economy which took place during the exchange of views by Anglicans and Orthodox and in the course of which it was made plain *that the proposed act of economy has no precedent in the history of the Orthodox Church.*"

(Italics ours). This speaks for itself. The Orthodox could not admit non-Orthodox orders as valid by economy, or in any other way, unless the teaching and practice of the non-Orthodox church approximated to the Orthodox teaching and practice concerning the sacraments of holy orders and the holy eucharist.

*Document iv*<sup>1</sup> is one of the publications of the Council for the Defence of Church Principles.<sup>2</sup> It is an address to the laity by a layman. Mr. Eliot says: "This is not a 'party' issue; it is not a question as to whether the Church of England should move in a more Catholic, or in a more Protestant direction. It is a more vital question than that: it is the question whether the Church of England shall survive or perish" (p. 1).

The United Church will be composed of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists. It will not however comprehend all the Christian bodies in South India: those remaining outside will be the Catholics (both of Latin rite and of two Syrian rites), the Baptists (American and Canadian), the Lutheran (American and Continental), and the other ancient "Syrian" churches. But the "New Church" will number about a million and will be "a more comprehensive Christian reunion than has ever been realized." And he argues that if the scheme be authorized in South India, and still more if it is brought into operation at home, it must lead to the disruption of the Church of England. There may already be great difference of teaching in the Church of England, but "she maintains her unity in spite of the differences and *because* we do not agree to disagree. Each party in this church can defend its own doctrine in the conviction that its doctrine is the true doctrine of the Church of England. . . . Once the Church of England agreed that all the questions on which its members differ should be left to individual opinion it would substitute, for the scandal of opposing doctrines, the phantom unity of a Church with no doctrine at all" (pp. 17, 18).

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his convocation address (*Document v*) which we have noticed above, while refraining from

<sup>1</sup> We do not know whether this should be placed before or after the Bishop of Gloucester's letter, since it has no date, but it certainly comes before v and vi.

<sup>2</sup>This council has published some ten or so pamphlets as the outcome of the South Indian Scheme.

giving any final judgement on the scheme, shows himself in his present judgement to be favourable, and he does his best to place the scheme in what he considers its proper background.

It is on this account that six superiors of certain religious communities of men have sent his Grace the open letter that is *document vi*. In this they stress in no faltering terms some eight points which cause them great anxiety in the proposed scheme. But their criticism is constructive, since they give what they consider to be the minimum assurance of right belief. We will summarize this. "That to maintain the adherence of the Anglican communion to Catholic faith and order, every province and diocese of the same can only be in communion with churches which :

1. Accept the Holy Scriptures as the norm by which doctrines of faith and morals are to be tested in such wise that no doctrine be taught—except such as is agreeable to the teaching of the Old and New Testaments, and in the teaching of the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops ;
2. Publicly profess belief in all the articles of the Nicene creed upon stated occasions in their worship ;
3. Require assent to all the articles of the Apostles' or Nicene creeds by or on behalf of every person to be baptized, and by every communicant, and require that every communicant have been baptized ;
4. Require evidence of baptism from every person presenting himself for ordination ; and demand before ordination from those who are to teach the faith not only an affirmation of belief in the Nicene creed, but a more detailed statement of orthodox doctrine ;
5. Teach that in the sacrament of baptism there is a cleansing from original sin together with the remission of actual sin, incorporation into Christ and the adoption unto sonship by God ; and that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful ; and that its celebration was ordained for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ ;
6. Teach that the episcopate is the appointed means whereby in the Catholic Church through the laying on of hands and prayer to the Holy Ghost bestows the special grace of Holy Orders, which is distinct from that conveyed in Baptism or Confirmation."



They go on to say : " We lay these propositions before your Grace as the essential and minimum safeguard of Catholic faith and order, without the observance of which by ourselves all thought of reunion with that three-quarters of Christendom represented by the historic Eastern and Western Churches must be for ever laid aside. Indeed, we fear that without their observance it is more than doubtful that the present unity of the Anglican communion could be for long preserved " (p.p. 11—13).

The South Indian Scheme and the outlook on church unity that it represents make us value the warning given by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical "*Mortalium Animos*." It also makes one realize that Christian co-operation and Christian unity are two distinct things. The first may lead and help towards the second, but there may be a period of years, even generations, before many Christian bodies are prepared sufficiently for the second in any real Catholic meaning of the term. It would seem that even in South India simply some sort of Christian co-operation might meet the need.

It is a pity that Dr. Temple, by the time he treats of the South Indian Scheme in his convocation address, seems to forget the first part of his address, where he stresses that so long as our ecclesiastical divisions remain the only kind of common Christian witness can but be Christian co-operation.

Christian unity can only be based on a oneness of dogmatic faith and sacramental life. Christian co-operation is based on a common belief in God and a common love of His law. Much good work, on this latter basis, is being done in Holland, France, U.S.A., and elsewhere, and the Sword of the Spirit in this country. The former must, of course, be the ultimate aim of all Christians, but this is especially the work of the Holy Ghost. We for our part must pray and help to do the work of preparation. The South Indian Scheme may be a means of stiffening those Anglicans throughout the world who are more and more approaching Catholic truth, and we should do all we can to help and encourage them to form themselves into a compact body, "An army set in battle array," under Mary's guidance.

## NEWS and COMMENTS

### *E.C.Q.* REPRINTS.

Owing to enemy action a large part of the stock of the *E.C.Q.* was destroyed. Consequently many very valuable series of articles are out of print. It is proposed, therefore, to bring out some of these series as *E.C.Q.* Reprints. We would be glad to hear from our readers as to what they consider demand a reprint. The first of the Series is already in the press. Actually this is a recently published article, but the demand for a reprint was immediate. It is the article by Professor Dvornik, *National Churches and the Church Universal*. This will be published by the Dacre Press, and will be on sale price 2s., at Pax House, Dacre Street, Westminster, S.W.1, and Geo. Coldwell, Ltd., Holborn, W.C.1.

We regret to announce the death of the Patriarch Sergius of Moscow. R.I.P.

A more detailed notice will be given in our next issue.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*He Who Is.* A Study in Traditional Theism. By E. L. Mascall, B.D. (Sub-Warden of Scholae Cancellarii, Lincoln. Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd). Longmans Green & Co. 1943. pp. xiii+210. 15s.

The value and importance of this book are very great. It is in the strict and proper sense of the words a restatement of the natural theology of St. Thomas in modern terms; that is, neither a piece of modern philosophizing masquerading in a Thomistic habit nor merely the *ipsissima verba* of St. Thomas Englished in a slightly less repulsive jargon than usual but without any attempt to deal properly with modern criticisms or to continue certain lines of thought where St. Thomas left off—and too many “modern restatements” are one or the other. This is an accurate and faithful statement of the traditional doctrine in language intelligible to modern philosophers, with a very thorough and successful attempt to deal respectfully and seriously with their criticisms and with certain important alternative philosophical theologies of recent times, together with a healthy readiness to develop St. Thomas’s lines of thought further than St. Thomas himself takes them

when the discussion of contemporary systems or objection makes it imperative to do so.

A restatement of this kind, and especially one as clear, concise and readable as Mr. Mascall's, was very badly needed in English. The author puts it forward as a "contribution to the reconstruction of Anglican theology." This it certainly is, and one of the most interesting features of the book is the way in which Mr. Mascall shows that the great Anglican theologians of the seventeenth century, for all their hostility to "Rome" remained thoroughly Thomist in their doctrine of God. Catholics should feel very deep gratitude that it has become possible again for an Anglican theologian to write a book of this kind. As lately as ten years ago it seemed as if there was a real danger of Catholic and Anglican theologians and philosophers moving permanently away from each other into two closed and mutually unintelligible worlds of thought. Now, as many other recent Anglican publications besides Mr. Mascall's book have shown, and as was very notably indicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent address to the Aquinas Society, there is coming to be recognised a broad and solid ground of commonly accepted traditional doctrine on which we can meet in charity to discuss our real continuing differences.

The parts of the book which will perhaps be of most value to English Catholic students of natural theology are those which deal with contemporary English philosophers. Translated works by Continental Catholic writers cannot be expected to cover this ground, and it is obviously of the greatest importance to us that it should be adequately covered. Dom Mark Pontifex certainly dealt very adequately with Professor Broad's criticisms of the Thomistic arguments for the existence of God, but his reply (like much other work of importance by the same admirable and most original Thomist) is buried in a back number of the *Downside Review* and therefore not widely accessible. So it is of great value to have Mr. Mascall's thorough consideration of Broad's objections and refutation of them on very much the same lines. Then we have a very satisfactory little skirmish with the Logical Positivists and, of more serious and enduring value, excellent appreciations and criticisms of the philosophical theologies of James Ward, Whitehead, and Tennant, and in general of all forms of theistic doctrine which maintain that creation is as necessary to God as God is to creation. The much-used argument from



religious experience and the Barthian denial of the possibility of natural theology also receive serious consideration, balanced evaluation, and drastic criticism; and the book throughout is written with continual reference to the relevant and really significant trends in contemporary English theological and philosophical thought.

Chapter X "Transcendence and Immanence" will be of particular interest to readers of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* because it contains what is probably the first attempt in English, except for those series of articles in the *E.C.Q.* to which Mr. Mascall refers, to discuss Sophiology from the traditional Thomist standpoint. The representatives of Sophiology selected are Berdyaev and Father van der Mensbrugghe, and there is a long note on Bulgakov. I am quite unqualified to discuss this remarkably difficult subject with any pretence at adequacy, but I can at least say that Mr. Mascall makes admirably clear what, as it seems to me, must be the deepest misgiving of any Catholic theologian or philosopher when trying to understand the meaning of the Orthodox Sophiologists. This is, whether Sophiology does not dangerously blur and obscure that sharp and absolute line of difference between Creator and creatures, between Being Himself and created beings, which it is absolutely essential for the Christian philosopher or theologian to keep clear if he is to continue to think as a Christian and not as a pagan.

The only criticisms which I have to make of the book have been so thoroughly anticipated by Mr. Mascall himself that it seems rather ungracious to make them. It is however, I think, worth while doing so, if only to indicate lines on which further work by Anglican and Catholic theologians and philosophers in England might usefully proceed. The first is that Mr. Mascall confines himself perhaps too rigidly to St. Thomas and that more detailed reference to the somewhat divergent solutions of problems raised in the text which have been put forward by other Christian thinkers of the great central tradition might at times have been valuable. In the discussion of the possibility of natural theology as against the Barthians, for instance, some reference might have been made to the views of St. Bonaventure; the comparison of him with St. Thomas on this point is rather enlightening. But Mr. Mascall has explained his reasons for following St. Thomas closely in the preface, and they are good ones. Perhaps if he had given a wider meaning to "traditional" he would

only have written a different and not so good a book. It must however be emphasised that the tradition of Catholic wisdom is more than even its greatest exponent, St. Thomas.

The other criticism is more serious. That is, the very inadequate consideration given to the doctrine of Analogy, which is after all the very heart, centre and foundation of traditional theism. It is too of particular importance for those of us who are trying to deal with modern Russian theology for, as it seems to me with my imperfect knowledge, it is only in the light of the doctrine of Analogy that the very real problems raised by the Sophiologists can ever be solved (as Mr. Mascall himself clearly indicates in his discussion of Father van der Mensbrugghe). Mr. Mascall says in his preface that he is fully conscious of the importance of the problem, but does not feel himself competent to deal with it. I hope he will forgive me if I say that, in view of his frequent, very illuminating references to the doctrine and its modern critics, and the general philosophical quality of his book, I simply do not believe in his alleged incompetence. One reason, perhaps, why he feels it, is the amount of unnecessary mystification with which the whole matter has been surrounded. It is significant that he refers to Przywara, whose treatment of the doctrine of *analogia entis* has in the opinion of some modern Thomists done more to befog than to clarify it. It is to be hoped that before too long we shall have something more on the subject from Dom Mark Pontifex, and that what he has already written will become more widely known. For some years now he has been quietly shedding a good deal of light on various aspects of the problem in the pages of the *Downside Review*.

Mr. Mascall's book is likely to remain for a long time indispensable to students of Natural Theology in England. I hope it will not only meet with the welcome it deserves both from Catholics and Anglicans, but will stimulate further work on the many important and fascinating problems which it so clearly and attractively discusses.

A. H. ARMSTRONG.

*The Judgement of the Nations.* By Christopher Dawson. (Sheed and Ward). pp. 154. 8s. 6d.

The author tells us in his foreword that: "Four years have gone to the making of this book. . . . Small as it is, it has cost me greater labour and thought than any book

that I have written." This in itself should recommend the book to all thoughtful readers, for Mr. Dawson holds a unique position as an historian and a philosopher of history.

For the good of the future we need to look with a very steady eye at our history as a whole so that we may learn all the lessons therein to be taught, for if we are to build up we must learn in humility from our failures of the past as well as take courage from our past success, and Christopher Dawson is in a position to help us to do this. This slender volume, Father John Murray tells us in *The Month* (March—April, 1943), is one of the most valuable books that have been published during the past three years.

Space does not allow us to consider the whole thesis; we will therefore confine ourselves to Mr. Dawson's vision for "The Return to Christian Unity." It is, then, to the careful investigation of this chapter IV that we set ourselves, though this chapter should not be viewed in complete isolation from the rest of the book.

The chapter seems to us to consider the problem on two levels, perhaps even on three levels, for that of the cultural order is also brought in. There is the level of the Natural Law, which is God's Law, and this is the platform on which the work of the Sword of the Spirit operates. Gathered together on this common basis in opposition to the totalitarian Antichrist there are all those who confess the name of Christ and even here some who are not Christians may be included. That there can be such a basis is witnessed by the way in which Christians, Jews and Mohammedans, etc., in the U.S.S.R. found themselves at one under the persecution of Materialistic Totalitarianism. Mr. Dawson then applies a principle of the Natural Law to the present conditions of divided Christendom, namely, the right of religious freedom. He quotes from Pope Pius XI's Encyclical on the Church in Germany: "The believer has an inalienable right to profess his faith and to practise it in the manner suited to him." He then goes on to state that the problem of Christian disunity is mainly one of schism, for heresy, he says, is as a rule not a cause of schism but an excuse for it, or rather a rationalization of it. Here Mr. Dawson speaks as an historian. The second level is that of the sacramental and supernatural.

This then should prepare the reader to approach the main problem (i.e., Christian Unity) on the lines suggested by our author: "The rigorist view," he says, "concentrates its

attention so much on the question of authority and ecclesiastical order that it ignores or undervalues the importance of the common beliefs, the common moral values, the common religious traditions and the common sacraments and forms of worship that exist in the midst of the religious divisions of the Christian world."

Now we think this can only be understood if it is realized that the approach is on both levels at once, or rather, because of the present condition of ununited Christians, some can only be approached on the one and some on both. But the approach is on the level of the sacraments and the supernatural wherever that is possible. And here one must avoid thinking only in terms of England in our critical reaction or recoil. The book is essentially dealing with Europe first, and then with the world; even the Sword of the Spirit, though originating in England, looks to be a world-wide movement. This, then, surely gives the right emphasis to these phrases, that seem to have taken many people by surprise:—"common religious traditions and the common sacraments and forms of worship." One must here first think in terms of the Orthodox Church and other Dissident Eastern Churches: these millions have the same sacramental life with us and the same holy Sacrifice of the Altar, and for the most part (leaving on one side the heresy of the "lesser Eastern Churches") the same dogmas of Faith. From this, the largest part of divided Christendom, we can turn to the West and here we have, in the case of very many of the Christian bodies, millions of those who are certainly baptized, and in many an approximation (which is growing in quite unexpected places) to Catholic worship or the vestiges (some very dim, some more pronounced) of the ancient worship that trace back to a common heritage. The following quotation from the review *Bessarione*, speaking of what now divides the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches, is not out of place here: "To achieve the union of the Churches we must first quell the fanaticism that exists among the clergy on both sides. After that we can with justice examine the claims of both East and West and discuss their reciprocal positions and privileges. In the third place, but not before, dogmatic divergences can be discussed: it was not dogmas which were the chief cause of separation. Understanding might be reached here without great difficulty: the chief cause of the separation was political." (Quoted by Père Jongar, O.P., in *Divided Christendom*, p. 280).



Though this can only apply in the strict sense to the East, it is this state of things in a mitigated form among ourselves that Mr. Dawson has in mind, and he is out to make his readers realize its importance. The work of the Sword of the Spirit can be considered as spade work in preparing the ground for ultimate Christian Unity. There is, however, the danger of considering Christian co-operation as the ultimate goal; or of considering Christian Unity as some sort of arrangement by which Christians can have the least possible amount of definite common belief in which they should agree (this seems to be in the mind of the framers of the South Indian Scheme). Now this cannot be so. Christian Unity, the Unity of the Church, was ever an idea in the mind of God; it is already here, now, in the midst of the World. Man has spoilt God's plan; individuals, groups, countries, all in origin Christian, have throughout the course of history separated themselves from the visible Church of God—the blame for which was often due to both sides—the present world crisis is, to a large extent, due to divided Christendom. The Allies at least have ranged themselves on the side of Natural Law; here is a God-given opportunity to build up something new and, if it should be permanent, it should rest on a united Christendom. Mr. Dawson brings in European Culture, both of the Latin West and that of Byzantium, because both were the fruit of the City of God, of a United Christendom; the principle of diversity in unity was thus laid which in this New Age may show further extension provided it is built on the freedom of the Christian Faith. The return to this Unity and its spread throughout the world is essentially the work of the Spirit of God.

The book is not a thesis in theology though it is dealing with the things of God, and it may be questioned whether it would be read or understood by the general public if it were couched in theological terms. By reading and pondering its pages may many be inspired to work for that great work of Christ:—"that they may all be one."

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

*The Balance of Truth.* E. I. Watkin. (Holliss & Carter, Ltd.)

Pp. 7+142. 9s.

It would be difficult to recall any period in the past when Truth appeared to have so many aspects or facets, according to the cutlook of the particular individuals or groups, each

intent upon their own acceptance of Truth—one group contradicting another—one insisting on one extreme, another on the opposite, and yet all claiming infallibility. Not the modest infallibility of the Church or the Pope, but extreme, ultimate infallibility—making themselves like to gods. In this volume, Mr. Watkin has produced a series of essays in search of Truth—where it is to be found, how recognised. As a true follower of the *Philosophia Perennis* he strenuously maintains the *Via Media* as opposed to the errors of Extremes. These essays are not merely destructive, or would-be destructive of such systems as Idealism or Materialism; Humanism gone astray, or other Philosophical errors that have been born of the revolt against traditional thought. They are intensely constructive in the line of the main trend of new thought, new experience, new knowledge, that has been for some time now associated with the revivifying of Scholastic thought. No one man, no one period of history has or ever will hold all Truth or has been capable of all Truth—this is a purely Divine attribute. Neither an Aristotle nor a St. Thomas, not even the official commentators of the latter, possessed such an attribute. The *Philosophia Perennis* must not belie its name—it is not a valley of dry bones—or if it has become such, or tends to become such, as many a student has found to his cost, then it must be made to live again by the breath of the Spirit. The die-hard here is on a level with the Freudian, with the Marxist, with the National Socialist. He is insisting on a partiality, taking the part for the whole, and usually with such insistence that he tends to infallibility, if not for himself, at least for his particular hero, whether it be Freud or St. Thomas.

It is in this first essay on Partialities that the author opens up the ground. From this starting point he drives ahead through the whole gamut of contradiction, half-truths, evasions, extremes that are connected with the names of philosophical systems. The essays themselves are a storehouse of thought—condensed thought, at times too much so. There are many ideas just hinted at—much that needs expanding. This is indeed a Scholastic treatise “enlivened by the author’s personal insight.” The Scholastic will find much to ponder over in the essay on Dialectic Ideal-Realism. Catholic principles accepted with real assent are pure dynamite, but not merely for the purposes of destruction. The Catholic storehouse contains also the means of construction on old foundations and in continuance of past effort. We do not look for



a new era—we have it at hand in the era of the Incarnation. Reconstruction for us is centred in this. It implies recognition of the Catholic outlook—that is, an objective and integral outlook whose philosophical expression is “the dialectic Ideal-Realism based on the abiding certitude of commonsense and rising to the heights of religious experience which it accepts and interprets.” For the religious experience is a true mode of knowledge. With these principles will come an organic synthesis of theocentrism and humanism—a reducing to practice of the ideal of the Liturgy, so far unrealized. This is the New Order—this the only hope of Reconstruction. “Nothing less will suffice humanity; the theocentrism of a contemplative Church, humanism developed to the utmost in the service and light of theocentrism.”

It is difficult to visualise the audience that Mr. Watkin has in mind. This is no milk for babes—much of it is strong meat. This is not due to the author's treatment, but to the inherent difficulty of the subject matter. On the other hand, it is a matter of the greatest importance and obviously holds the key to that multitude of problems which faces the modern world, problems that all concerned with Reconstruction, whether with Youth Movements, the Liturgical Movement or any other dynamic force that is making itself felt as an undercurrent of the flood in which we are all immersed, must encounter. For there is a Wind, “I mean the Spirit, which is sweeping nations with a broom”—there is the restless movings of vast multitudes seeking ultimate Truth; and who shall hold the Balance?

DOM ANSELM THATCHER.

*Hieronimo Giustiniani's History of Chios*, edited, with an Introduction, by Philip P. Argenti. (Cambridge University Press.) Pages 462+xxxv. £2 2s. net.

Hieronimo Giustiniani's *History of Chios* has hitherto been known chiefly through an early but incomplete French version. Mr. Argenti now gives his edition of the original Italian MS. dated 1586 and recently discovered by him among the State Archives in Rome.

For two centuries Chios was governed on behalf of Genoa by the Giustiniani, the family of the author, who wrote some twenty years after the Turkish occupation of 1566. His History covers a very wide field of information treating of the island, its natural features and agricultural development, its

inhabitants and their social and religious customs, in great detail. He also allows scope to his religious and philosophical reflections, and not least to his versatile curiosity. Written in a leisurely style, it is a book to be enjoyed in leisurely reading, though a full index will assist those who wish to use it for reference. Some Addenda and Corrigenda are provided by the editor to clear up obscurities, but the text will be understood without difficulty by anyone familiar with modern Italian.

As a devout Catholic Italian of the sixteenth century, the author takes the Faith for granted, and so he does not treat religious matters with a detachment to which we are now more accustomed. There is probably little if anything new in the ecclesiastical information here to be found, but as a contemporary account of Greek liturgical practices in the sixteenth century the work must be of considerable value. The island always remained predominantly Orthodox, and, for the most part, under the Giustiniani régime relations between Greeks and Latins seem to have been marked by mutual tolerance.

The book is beautifully printed, and, in fact, its whole production is a notably fine achievement at a very moderate price.

P.P.I.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

Geoffrey Bles : *Slavery and Freedom*. Nicolas Berdyaev. *The Incarnation and the Word of God*. St. Athanasius.

S.C.M. Press : *Three Russian Prophets*. Nicolas Zernov.

Dacre Press : *Russian Letters of Direction*. Macarius.

Burns, Oates and Washbourne : *The Christian Sacrifice*. E. Measure.

World Conference on Faith and Order : *Concerning inter-communion and open communion*.

The Polish Research Centre : *The Orthodox Eastern Church of Poland*.